

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

|                                |             |            | •                         |                     |                  |  |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO.                | FILING DATE |            | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR      | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
| 10/821,363                     | 04/09/2004  |            | Marijan Elizabeth Grogoza | ASP 2-001 1213      |                  |  |
| 7                              | 590         | 09/09/2005 |                           | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| Jerry K. Mue<br>Mueller and Si |             |            | SHAW, ELIZABETH ANNE      |                     |                  |  |
| 7700 Rivers E                  |             |            |                           | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| Columbus, OF                   |             |            |                           | 3644                |                  |  |
|                                |             |            |                           |                     |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  |   | 1 4 - 11 1  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Aution Communication  | 10/821,363  | GROGOZA ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Elizabeth A. Shaw   | 3644  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | pears on the cover sheet with the o   | correspondence address  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE.                     | mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 A</u>   | <u>pril 2004</u> .  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This   | action is non-final.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| • •  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.  | •   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o   | or election requirement.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine   | er.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc   | D) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct   | - · ·   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | xaminer. Note the attached Office   | e Action or form PTO-152.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> </ul>   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) Interview Summar   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>   | Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal C  6) Other:  | Patent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/821,363

Art Unit: 3644

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Longtin (6,574,948)

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Longtin shows an equine safety garment for a horse to wear during hunting season and at night comprising an equine garment 12, 16 made of highly visible mesh fabric, col. 4, lines 21-26, specifically in "blaze orange" and has highly visible reflective strips 28 affixed thereto.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Longtin in view of Miller et al (6,267,482). Miller et al show a garment 10 having reflective strips 14 and lights 16. With respect to claims 2 and 26, to use the lights of Miller et al with the garment of Longtin would have been obvious to one skilled in the art in order to increase visibility of the wearer by not needing to rely on reflected light to illuminate the wearer.

Claims 5-13, 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White, Jr. (6,050,068) in view of Longtin (6,574,948). White, Jr. shows a turn out horse fly mask 20 composed of mesh fabric having a rear edge 50 behind the horse's ears to a lower edge 118 at the horse's cheekbone and having a mesh pleated area 74 to create a stand-up area away from the horse's eyes and an ear accommodating area 110, 114 for the horse's ears 30. The rear 50 and lower edges 118 terminating about the lower jaw 44 and are releasably fastenable 58 thereat, the edges being covered by fabric webbing. The mesh is made of polyester coated with vinyl. Longtin teaches the use of a high visibility colored fabric and the use of reflective strips on the horse's head covering garment 12, the garment having fabric to fit over the ears of the horse. With respect to claims 5 and 15, to use the coloration and the reflective strips of Longtin on

Art Unit: 3644

the horse mask of White, Jr. would have been obvious to one skilled in the art as a replacement of functional equivalents.

Claims 14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White, Jr. in view of Longtin as applied to claim 5 above and further in view of Miller et al. With respect to claims 14 and 24, to use the lights of Miller et al with the garment of the combination of White, Jr. and Longtin would have been obvious to one skilled in the art in order to increase visibility of the wearer by not needing to rely on reflected light to illuminate the wearer.

Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Longtin. With respect to claims 29-31, to use a specific type of fabric such as vinyl, since none is specified, would have been obvious to one skilled in the art in order to vary the use of the garment or to allow the garment to be worn in various environmental conditions.

### **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3644

Claims 1-31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,948. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Longtin shows an equine safety garment for a horse made of high visibility mesh in "blaze orange" and having reflective strips affixed thereto.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Included for further reference are: Rapisarda (5,649,755), McMahon (6,128,891), Hung (6,216,642), Bayer (6,345,393), Golle et al (6,769,138) and Hsieh (2002/0122316).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. Shaw whose telephone number is 571-272-6908. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 10:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 3644

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elizabeth A. Shaw

Examiner Art Unit 3644

August 25, 2005

TERI PHAM LUU SUPERVISORY

PRIMARY EXAMINER